

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 25 is newly entered and includes limitations of claims 1, 4 and 5. Claim 26 is newly entered and includes limitations of claims 16 and 24.

- 5 Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations recited in claims 2, 3, 4, and 9, and claims 2, 3, 4, and 9 have been cancelled accordingly. In addition, the dependency of claims 5 and 7 has been amended due to the cancellation of claim 4.

- 10 Claim 10 has been amended to more clearly define the claimed Data-partitioned intra video object plane (DP-I VOP) and Data partitioned predicted video object plane (DP-P VOP), which is fully supported by specification paragraph [0006] of applicant's disclosure.

Claim 16 has been amended to include limitations recited in claim 20, and claim 20 has been cancelled accordingly.

As no new matter is introduced, acceptance of above-identified claim amendments is respectfully requested.

15

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 10-15, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Sekiguchi et al. (US 6493385 B1).

Response:

- 20 Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include the claimed limitation “the predetermined lookup table specifically corresponding to the VOP type the decoding module is to decode is transmitted from the switching circuit to the decoding module only when the decoding module requires the predetermined lookup table to complete the decoding of the VOP type”.

- 25 (*emphasis added*) The applicant asserts that this claimed feature is not anticipated by Sekiguchi.

On page 3 of the Office action dated 12/31/2007, Examiner states, “Therefore, the

lookup tables are only used when a coding mode requiring the lookup table is passed through the system, not when the block is skipped". The applicant points out that the claimed limitation is mistakenly considered by Examiner. Referring to Sekiguchi Fig. 30, the lookup tables, MBTYPE-1 table and MBTYPE-1 table, are stored in decoding units (117) and (118) respectively, and the change-over unit (116) is to direct the incoming data to either the decoding unit (117) or the decoding unit (118). Further description pertinent to operations of the decoding units, the lookup tables, and the change-over unit is shown in col. 24, lines 41-56 of Sekiguchi's disclosure. Note is made by the applicant that Sekiguchi neither teach nor suggest **transmitting** a lookup table, either MBTYPE-1 table or MBTYPE-1 table, **via the change-over unit** to a decoding unit **only when** the lookup table is required for completing the decoding process. In other words, upon careful review of the cited reference, the applicant respectfully points out that Sekiguchi's disclosure is silent on transmitting the requested lookup table to the decoding unit on demand. In addition, using the change-over unit to transmit the lookup table that is already stored in the decoding unit is illogical.

15 In view of above reasons, the applicant asserts that claim 1 should be found patentable over the cited reference. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 10

Claim 10 has been amended to define that each of the Data-partitioned intra video object plane (DP-I VOP) and the Data partitioned predicted video object plane (DP-P VOP) is configured to separate motion information from **texture information**. Examiner states that Sekiguchi's motion compensation unit processes data partitioned VOPs, since it receives separate signals for the shape data and motion data. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

25 In col. 13, lines 6-11, Sekiguchi explicitly states, "However, even though the picture coding apparatus corresponds to the MPEG-4, in cases where a rectangular picture frame of a television signal or the like is, for example, used as a picture-to-be-coded, because shape data indicates a constant rectangle, the shape coding unit 34 is not required". (*emphasis added*) Therefore, the shape data is to indicate shape of an object to be displayed rather than texture

of the object to be displayed. The applicant asserts that the shape data taught by Sekiguchi is different from the claimed texture information. As a result, the combination of the shape data and the motion data processed by Sekiguchi's motion compensation unit fails to read on the claimed partitioned VOPs.

5 Furthermore, the applicant points out that the claimed multiplexer is not anticipated by Sekiguchi, either. On page 3 of the Office action dated 12/31/2007, Examiner states, "In the motion compensation unit, a change-over is performed in response to the MBTYPE. The output from the selected prediction unit is then sent to the memory". In view of the arguments set forth hereinafter, the applicant asserts that the claimed limitation is mistakenly considered
10 and the teaching of Sekiguchi is misinterpreted by Examiner.

 Referring to Sekiguchi Fig. 31, the change-over unit (141) has a single input node for receiving the motion information (310) and a plurality of output nodes coupled to the direct prediction unit (142), the forward prediction unit (143), the backward prediction unit (144), and the bidirectional prediction unit (145) respectively. However, applicant's claimed
15 multiplexer is defined to have **a plurality of inputs respectively connected to outputs of the plurality of video decoding modules** and having **an output connected to the memory**. The applicant therefore asserts that the change-over unit implemented in Sekiguchi's motion compensation unit fails to read on the claimed multiplexer having the above-identified hardware configuration.

20 In addition, upon careful review of Sekiguchi's disclosure, the applicant finds no description pertinent to storing the outputs of the prediction units shown in Sekiguchi Fig. 31 to the memory (75). However, comparing the embodiment shown in Sekiguchi Figs. 23 and 25 with the embodiment in Sekiguchi Figs. 29 and 31, both embodiments have similar motion compensation architectures. With regard to the motion compensating unit (74) shown
25 in Sekiguchi Figs. 23 and 25, Sekiguchi explicitly teaches that a motion compensation is performed to extract a predicted picture (219) from a reference picture (218) stored in the memory (75) and then transmit the predicted picture (219) to the change-over unit (76) in col. 20, lines 23-127. In view of operations of the motion compensating unit (74) taught by

Sekiguchi, the applicant therefore asserts a person skilled in the art would readily appreciate that the analogous motion compensating unit (104) shown in Sekiguchi Figs. 29 and 31 extracts a predicted picture from a reference picture stored in the memory (75) and then transmits the predicted picture to the change-over unit (76) rather than the memory (75). In
5 short, Sekiguchi fails to teach or suggest that the output from the selected prediction unit is sent to the memory.

In light of above reasons, the applicant asserts that claim 10 should be found allowable over the cited reference. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

10 Claims 11-15, 21, and 22

Claims 11-15, 21, and 22 are dependent upon claims 1 and 10 respectively, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 10 are found allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

15 Claims 2-9, 16-20, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekiguchi et al. (US 6493385 B1).

Response:

Claims 2-9

20 Claims 2-4 and 9 have been cancelled. Claims 5-8 are dependent upon claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable.

Claims 16-20 and 23-24

25 With regard to claim 16, the applicant has amended claim 16 to include the claimed limitation “transmitting the corresponding lookup table of the type of VOP the decoding module is to decode from a switching circuit to the decoding module only when the decoding module requires the predetermined lookup table to complete the decoding of the VOP type”. (*emphasis added*) In view of above arguments of claim 1, the applicant asserts that this claimed feature is neither taught nor suggested by Sekiguchi. Withdrawal of the rejection to

claim 16 is respectfully requested.

Claim 20 has been cancelled. Claims 17-19 and 23-24 are dependent upon claim 16, and should be allowed if claim 16 is found allowable.


5 **Patentability of New Claims 25 and 26**

Claim 25 includes the claimed limitation “a multiplexer having an input connected to an output of the decoding module for selectively outputting the decoded result to a memory for further processing,” and claim 26 includes the claimed limitation ”multiplexing a decoded result of the decoding module to selectively output the decoded result to a memory for further
10 processing”. In view of above arguments of claims 1 and 10, the applicant asserts that these claimed features are neither taught nor suggested by the cited reference. Therefore, the newly added claims 25 and 26 have been placed in condition for allowance.

The applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this
15 case. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned applicant’s representative at the number indicated below.

Appl. No. 10/605,744
Amdt. dated March 26, 2008
Reply to Office action of December 31, 2007

Sincerely yours,



Date: 03/26/2008

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)